

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-7 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 AND 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BARNI ET AL. (US 6,064,981) IN VIEW OF WALKER ET AL. (US 5,794,207)

Barni et al. ("Barni") is different from the present invention because Barni teaches that a customer's desired purchasing price is transmitted equally to all the freight companies participating in the auction.

Walker et al. ("Walker") teaches that a central controller 200 can display CPO 100 only to the most appropriate sellers and that multiple sellers may bind CPO 100 (see column 18, lines 19-20 and column 20, lines 5-15).

However, Barni and Walker, either alone or combination, do not teach the feature of displaying a search result screen having an ordering button (radio button) and a desired purchasing price input box to allow the user to select either ordering the product or inputting a desired purchasing price (see, for example, claim 1 of the present invention). With this screen, the user can confirm the search result (the normal selling prices), and at the same time, the user can order the product or start price negotiation, depending on the search result. Support for this feature may be found, for example, in FIG. 8 and at page 8 of the Applicant's specification.

Similar to claim 1, independent claims 2, 4, 5, and 7 also describe the feature of "displaying a search result screen showing an ordering button and a desired price input box on a user device to allow the user to select either ordering the product or inputting a desired purchasing price." Therefore, it is submitted independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 patentably distinguish over Barni and Walker.

Claims 8 and 10 (depending from independent claim 7) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claim 7.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 6, AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BARNI ET AL. (US 6,064,981) IN VIEW OF YAMAJI ET AL. (US 2002/0010611)

As mentioned in section II above, Barni is different from the present invention because Barni teaches that a customer's desired purchasing price is transmitted equally to all the freight companies participating in the auction.

Yamaji et al. ("Yamaji") describes a system in which the order taking server 101 displays options for automatic notification onto the screen of the customer, for example, displays options regarding the notifying format such as automatic notification of every change in service contents, automatic notification which is executed only when the discount rate changes by a predetermined value or more (see paragraph 0074).

However, Barni and Yamaji, either alone or combination, do not teach the feature of displaying a search result screen having an ordering button (radio button) and a desired purchasing price input box to allow the user to select either ordering the product or inputting a desired purchasing price (see, for example, claim 3 of the present invention).

Similar to claim 3, independent claim 6 describes the feature of "displaying a search result screen showing an ordering button and a desired price input box on a user device to allow the user to select either ordering the product or inputting a desired purchasing price." Therefore, independent claims 3 and 6 patentably distinguish over Barni and Yamaji.

Claim 9 (depending from independent claim 7) recite patentably distinguishing features of its own, and further, is at least patentably distinguishing due to its dependency from independent claim 7.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.


Serial No. 09/942,912

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11-9-06

By: 
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501